

**Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.**—The point is where the Government refuses to answer a supplementary on the ground that it is of a confidential nature, it is not enough, it should also be considered confidential in the opinion of the Speaker. Otherwise, he can direct the Government to provide the answer.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The Hon'ble Member is referring to Rule No. 37. Rule No. 37 is of a different character altogether. A member tables a certain question. Suppose a member is absent from the House. The point is whether the Speaker can compel the Treasury Benches, the Hon'ble Ministers, to answer a question. He may do so, if it is in the public interest. That is a different matter. But if the Government were to say that an answer to a question is of a confidential nature, there is absolutely no power for the Chair to compel the Government to give the reply. There are two things in Rule 37. Firstly the member should be absent and secondly there should be a request from the Minister that the answer may be given. In that case, power lies with the Speaker to compel the Minister to give a reply. In this case, if the Government were to say that it is not in the public interest to disclose the answer as it is of a confidential nature, the Chair has no right to compel them.

---

### MEMBERS SWORN.

Sri B. Singri Gowda (Magadi).

Sri S. Sharan Gowda (Jewargi).

---

### Adjournment Motions (Mode of Disposal).

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Before we start with the other business of the House, I have to make an announcement. Two adjournment motions have been tabled by two Hon'ble Members Sri M. Ramappa and Sri K. T. Dasappa. I have disallowed them. Usually, the

practice is that when an adjournment motion is patently inadmissible, it is disallowed by the Speaker in the chamber and a letter is addressed to the Hon'ble Member and no reference is made in this behalf. In this case what happened is, Sri Ramappa referred this matter yesterday and wanted to know as to what the fate of his adjournment motion was. So, I have to make a few observations in this respect, *i.e.*, that the adjournment motions of Sri M. Ramappa and Sri K. T. Dasappa have been disallowed by me and a letter to that effect would be addressed to them. The reasons would also be given in that letter. By the way, I may also mention that when other parliamentary opportunities are normally available to Hon'ble Members to express their opinion on the matter, an adjournment motion is not allowed. On the discussion of the Motion of Thanks, Sri Ramappa has also tabled an amendment covering the matter of the adjournment motion. So, he has ample opportunity. He can also raise this question by means of a short notice question. It will be answered by the Minister and the member can raise a half-an-hour's discussion on that. So, I think there is no necessity to allow this adjournment motion which could be discussed evidently on other occasions.

Similar is the fate of the adjournment motion of Sri K. T. Dasappa. We are amending the rules and we will have more opportunities such as, bringing to the notice of the Minister certain matter of public interest and asking him to make a statement and secondly to raise the question in the House. These are not available for the present under the present rules. These are available in the Lok Sabha and the Rules-making Committee has adopted these rules. These rules would be available to Hon'ble Members soon and a day would be given when Hon'ble Members would debate the rules and adopt them.

This being so, I am extremely sorry that I am not able to admit these adjournment motions of my Hon'ble friends.

---